



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/813,926	03/20/2001	Robert Douglas Werner	P2660-730	1841

21839 7590 06/01/2006

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC  
(INCLUDING BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS)  
POST OFFICE BOX 1404  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

REILLY, SEAN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/813,926	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WERNER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Dung Dinh	<b>Art Unit</b> 2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/1/06.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-44, 46-78, 80-112 and 114-135 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-44, 46-78, 80-112 and 114-135 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 2153

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 3/01/2006 have been fully considered. Applicant's challenge of the Examiner's official notice is noted. Below is a new ground of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

Claims 24-25, 57-58, 91-92, 125-126 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because the term "said content" lacks proper antecedent basis. It is unclear if "said content" is referring to the video content or some other content. There is no prior mention of a content.

Claims 26, 59, 93, and 127 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because the term "said additional content" lacks proper antecedent basis.

Claim 44 is rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because the term "said link" lacks proper antecedent basis. Claim 44 seems to fit better as dependent of claims 42 or 43.

Claims 46,47 and 80,81 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. They are dependent upon canceled claims 45 and 79. Correction is required.

Art Unit: 2153

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-16, 27-34; 35-39, 41-44, 49, 60-67; 68-73, 75-78, 80-83, 94-101; 102-107, 109-112, 114-117, 133-135 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant admitted prior art (AAPR), Thompson et al. (US Pub no. 2002/10077900) and Katinsky et al. (US patent 6,452,609).

In considering independent claims 1, 68, & 102, AAPR provides a method comprising:

displaying in a user interface at said user computer a web page containing at least one link to an electronic video file, selecting said link to request said video file [see Applicant specification page 1];

downloading said video file to said user computer in response to said request, detecting by said user computer an initial receipt of said video file, and opening is said user

Art Unit: 2153

interface a window of a video player, reading said video file by said player to play said video in said window [page 2 1st paragraph].

The AAPR does not automatically open the video player in a full screen mode.

In similar art of streaming video, Thompson teaches at initial receipt of the video file, automatically opening in said user interface a window of a video player in full screen mode [fig. 4, step26, [0025]].

Thompson discloses that it is advantageous to display video in full screen mode because it captures the user attention and decreases the chances of the user interrupting the video playback ([0025], [0026]). Hence, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to launch a video player in full screen mode because it would have provided larger display area and captured full attention of the user.

AAPR and Thompson does not teach encoding the video file with plurality of tracks, inserting instructions into one of the tracks, wherein the instructions include instruction relating to the download status and displaying a status indicator.

In similar filed of invention, Levi teaches a format for multiple media streams transmission. Levi teaches providing a plurality of tracks (col.3 line 55 to col.4 line 10: audio, video,

Art Unit: 2153

index, header), inserting instructions into one of the tracks including instruction regarding status information (col.4 lines 38-50 properties, play-duration, markers; and col.7 lines 32-42 script commands).. Levi discloses the format permit streaming of varying media, varying packet sizes, flexible timing and error correction (see col. 1 lines 15-30). Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the stream format of Levi with Thompson because it would have provided improved media streaming format.

Thompson and Levi do not specifically disclose displaying download status information. Displaying download status while receiving a video stream is well known in the art. In similar art of providing video streaming, Katinsky discloses a video player user interface having download status display (see fig.7 #112, #110, #114; col.6 lines 12-18: amount remains to be played, current media status, total duration, elapsed time). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have instruction for display the download status of the video file because it would have enable to see the status and know his current viewing position.

In considering claims 35-36, it is rejected under similar rationale as for claim 1 above. However, Thompson does not specifically disclose the browser open the video according to a

Art Unit: 2153

mode flag in the header of the video file. It is known in the art to specify a display size in the header of the video file.

Katinsky discloses opening in video in a size specified by in the video file (see col.6 lines 45-60). Thompson discloses that it is desirable to open advertisement video in a full-screen mode ([0025], specifically lines 13-15). Hence, providing a mode flag in the header of the video file to specify the default viewing size, including a full-screen mode, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because it would have enabled video advertisement producers to effectively control the presentation of their ads.

In considering claims 2, 69, & 103, the AAPR discloses:

detecting by said web server of header information for said video file and launching by said web browser said player [pages 1-2].

In considering claims 3, 71 & 105, Thompson does not teach detecting a mode flag and opening a window according the mode flag. These claims are rejected under the same obviousness rationale as stated for claim 35 above.

In considering claims 4, 37, 70, & 104, Thompson discloses:

said opening occurs absent user interaction [fig. 4, step 26, [0025]].

Art Unit: 2153

In considering claims 5, 38, 72, & 106, AAPR and Thompson teach:

sending a request from said user computer to a server at which said video file is locatable and in response to said request, downloading said video file from said server to said user computer ([Spec. pages 1-2], [Thompson [0022], [0025]]).

In considering claims 6, 39, 73, & 107, Thompson discloses: said reading occurs contemporaneously with said downloading [("streaming video") [0025], claim 12].

In considering claims 8, 41, 75 & 109, Levi teaches reading the instruction and displaying in the window information according to the instruction (apparent from col.7 lines 32-37, 55-64; col.8 lines 1-5).

In considering claims 9-10, 42-43, 76-77, 110-111, Levi teaches inserting instruction to display a URL to a select website (col.7 lines 65-67). It is apparent that the display of the URL would involve displaying a hyperlink anchor.

In considering claims 11, 44, 78, 112, Levi does not specifically disclose displaying an icon anchored to the URL. It well known in the art to have icon anchored to a URL (e.g. buttons, arrows, images). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to display an icon anchored to the URL



Art Unit: 2153

because it would have provided a compact visual representation of the hyperlink.

In considering claims 13, 46, 80, 114, Katinsky teaches displaying continuously refreshable status bar (col.6 lines 10-17, current position, time elapsed, etc.).

In considering claims 14, 47, 81, 115, Katinsky teaches displaying continuously refreshable hash mark (fig.7 the left portion of the progress bar 110).

In considering claims 15, 48, 82, 116, Levi teaches inserting instruction to additional video content (col.8 lines 1-5). It is apparent that the player would play the additional video according to the instruction inserted.

In considering claims 16, 49, 83, 117, Thompson discloses:  
said opening includes generating in said window a viewing screen area and a border adjacent at least one edge of said viewing screen area, said video being played in said viewing screen area [fig. 4, step26, [0025] - apparent from displaying in a full-screen mode].

As per claims 27-28, 60-61, 94-95 Levi teaches inserting instruction to additional video content (col.8 lines 1-5). Levi does not specifically disclose displaying a button for the additional video. It well known in the art to have a display button representing link to content. It would have been obvious

Art Unit: 2153

for one of ordinary skill in the art to display button linked to the additional video because it would have provided a compact visual control to retrieve the additional video. It is apparent that activation of the button would download the additional video file.

As per claims 29, 62, 96, the limitations of inserting instruction for the display of the button would be apparent from Levi as modified in order to instruct the player to display the button linking to the additional video file.

As per claims 30, 63, 97, providing unique association of a button to a video file would have been obvious. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivate to distinguish the button so as to enable a user to visually distinguish the contents associated with the buttons.

As per claims 31, 64, 98, it is apparent in the system as modified that selecting the button would plays the video linked to the button.

As per claims 32, 65, 99, 133 it is apparent in the system as modified that the handler of the player must read the instruction from the stream and monitoring the download to provide status information to be displayed.

Art Unit: 2153

As per claims 33, 66, 100, 134, Katinsky discloses the video stream has information about the size of the video (col.6 line 50 default size of the media).

As per claims 34, 67, 101, 135, Levi teaches the instruction include download management of the video file (col.4 lines 37-60, properties: number of packets, play duration, preroll, max, min\_packet\_size, etc.).

Claims 7, 40, 74 & 108 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPR, Thompson, Levi and Katinsky as applied to claims 1, 35, 68 and 102 above, and further in view of Abato et al. (US 6,513,069).

In considering claims 7, 40, 74, & 108, while Thompson discloses downloading a video file to a user computer, Thompson does not explicitly disclose compressing and decompressing the video file. Nonetheless, in analogous art, Abato discloses downloading a video to a user computer (col. 5, lines 41-49). Abato further discloses:

compressing said video file prior to said downloading [col. 5, lines 49-53; and

decompressing said video file contemporaneously with said reading [col. 10, lines 56-67].

Art Unit: 2153

Given the teachings of Abato, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system/method disclosed by Thompson where the video file would be compressed prior to downloading and decompress contemporaneously with said reading. This would have been a desirable feature to minimize resources by utilizing a lower bandwidth to transmit the video files over the Internet.

Claims 17-26, 50-59, 84-93, 118-132 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPR, Thompson, Levi and Katinsky as applied to claims 1, 35, 68 and 102 above, and further in view of Smith (US 6,448,986).

As per claims 17, 50, 84, 118, Levi teaches encoding the video with a plurality of tracks and inserting instruction into a selected one of the tracks (col.4 lines 38-50 properties, play-duration, markers; and col.7 lines 32-42 script commands). It is apparent that a handler at the client must read the instruction to carry out the inserted instruction. Levi teaches providing instruction to another video file. It is apparent that the video would be play within the screen area. The Thompson, Levi and Katinsky do not specifically disclose displaying in a border adjacent to one edge of the screen area. It is well known in the art to display information or controls at an edge of the screen

Art Unit: 2153

area so as to minimize occupation of the display area. In analogous art of user interface, Smith teaches providing GUI controls at an edge of the display area (see fig.2, col.7 lines 5-40) so as to reduce impinging upon or masking image in the work area of the screen (col.4 lines 65-68). Hence, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to display information or controls in a bar next to an edge of the display area because it would have reduced impinging and maximized the amount of viewable data area.

As per claims 18-19, 51-52, 85-86, 119-120, Levi teaches inserting instruction to display a URL to a select website (col.7 lines 65-67). It is apparent that the display of the URL would involve displaying a hyperlink anchor.

As per claims 20, 53, 87, 121, Levi does not specifically disclose displaying an icon anchored to the URL. It well known in the art to have icon anchored to a URL (e.g. buttons, arrows, images). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to display an icon anchored to the URL because it would have provided a compact visual representation of the hyperlink.

As per claims 21-22, 54-55, 88-89, 122-123, Katinsky teaches displaying continuously refreshable status bar (col.6 lines 10-17, current position, time elapsed, etc.).

Art Unit: 2153

As per claims 23, 56, 90, 124, Katinsky teaches displaying continuously refreshable hash mark (fig.7 the left portion of the progress bar 110).

As per claims 24, 57, 91, 125, Levi teaches inserting instruction to additional video content (col.8 lines 1-5). It is apparent that the video would be displayed in the screen area.

As per claims 25-26, 58-59, 92-93, 126-127, Levi does not specifically disclose displaying a content prior to playing the video. Levi discloses providing a 'preroll' delay time to buffer the data before starting to play (col.4 lines 47-50). Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to display a low bandwidth content (such as a static image or text message) because it would have kept the user informed while the media player buffered the stream data.

As per claims 128-129, Levi teaches inserting instruction to additional video content (col.8 lines 1-5). Levi does not specifically disclose displaying a button for the additional video. It well known in the art to have a display button representing link to content. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to display button linked to the additional video because it would have provided a compact visual control to retrieve the additional video. It is apparent that activation of the button would download the additional video file.

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 130, the limitations of inserting instruction for the display of the button would be apparent from Levi as modified in order to instruct the player to display the button linking to the additional video file.

As per claim 131, providing unique association of a button to a video file would have been obvious. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to distinguish the button so as to enable a user to visually distinguish the contents associated with the buttons.

As per claim 132, it is apparent in the system as modified that selecting the button would play the video linked to the button.

### **Conclusion**

Examiner Sean Reilly will take over the examination of this application starting May 29, 2006. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sean Reilly whose telephone number is (571) 272-4228.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached at (571) 272-3949.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system,

Art Unit: 2153

see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Dung Dinh', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Dung Dinh  
Primary Examiner  
May 16, 2006